

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are in the application. Independent claims 1, 18, and 24 have been amended to clarify the electro-mechanical features of the universal joint. No claims have been added or canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and examination in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 10-19, 24, and 28-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrison (USPN 6,240,302, hereinafter "Harrison"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that Harrison does not teach each and every feature of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 18, and 24.

Claim 1

Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended claim 1 is drawn to a modular apparatus for integrating mobile computing device features with a wireless communication device. The apparatus comprises, among other features, a universal joint with mechanical latch positions rotatably attaching the information input/output device to the wireless communication device at the universal joint. The universal joint also allows separation of the information input/output device from the wireless communication device. Thus, when the information input/output device and the wireless communication device are connected, the information input/output device interacts with the information processing module to integrate mobile computing features with the wireless communication device.

In contrast, Harrison teaches a wireless telephone with a removable personal information manager ("PIM"). The wireless telephone includes a PC card that is inserted into a card slot of the PIM. The wireless telephone and the PIM are connected via an electrical socket 36 of the PC card and an electrical plug 58 of the PIM configured to mate with the electrical socket 36. The Office Action cites figure 2 of Harrison and asserts that the electrical socket 36 and plug 58 discloses a universal joint with mechanical latch positions rotatably attaching the information input/output device to the wireless communication device at the universal joint as recited in amended claim 1. Applicant disagrees and asserts that it is clear from figure 2 of Harrison that the electrical socket 36 and plug 58 have no mechanical rotatable parts interface and thus, do

teach or suggest a universal joint with mechanical latch positions. Harrison also does not teach or suggest a universal joint rotatably attaching the wireless telephone and the PIM. (See figure 2, column 3, lines 23-24 and lines 65-67).

Additionally, although the wireless device has a hinge 28 serving as a point of rotation and connection for the PC card, Harrison still fails to teach a point of rotation that attaches the information input/output device to the wireless communication device at said point and allows separation of the information input/output device from the wireless communication device. The hinge 28 taught in Harrison does not connect to the PIM or allow separation. Thus, in view of the above-articulated reasons, Applicant's amended claim 1 is allowable over Harrison.

At least because dependent claims 2-3 and 10-17 inherit the features of amended claim 1, dependent claims 2-3 and 10-17 are also allowable over Harrison.

Claim 18

Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended independent claim 18 is drawn to an integrated computing wireless communication apparatus for integrating mobile computing device features with a wireless communication device. The apparatus comprises, among other features, a handheld information input/output device having a display presenting an output image and an input device, the output image having an orientation based upon selection of single-hand input into the input device. The apparatus also comprises, among other features, a universal joint with mechanical latch positions connecting the handheld information input/output device to the cellular telephone module, the universal joint latches in at least one position fastening the cellular telephone module to and in a relative position to the handheld information input/output device to allow a user to hold with one hand both devices and input information with the same hand.

The Office Action cites figure 1 and items 12 and 43 in support of an assertion that Harrison discloses a handheld information input/output device having a display presenting an output image and an input device, the output image having an orientation based upon selection of single-hand input into the input device. Applicant respectfully submits that although figure 1 of Harrison discloses a wireless telephone 12 with a PC card 14 in connection with a PIM 42, Harrison fails to teach or suggest an output image having an orientation based upon selection of single-hand input into the input device. Orientation of an output image is not mentioned anywhere in Harrison. Additionally, the Office Action acknowledges that "Harrison doesn't

disclose that the display presents an output image...wherein the output image is adapted for left-hand orientation... or wherein the output image is adapted for right-hand orientation" on page 5, 2nd paragraph of the present Office Action. Thus, Applicant's amended claim 18 is not anticipated for at least the above-articulated reasons.

Further, as described above, the Office Action asserts that figure 2 and items 36 and 58 of Harrison disclose a universal joint with mechanical latch positions connecting the handheld information input/output device to the cellular telephone module, the universal joint latches in at least one position fastening the cellular telephone module to and in a relative position to the handheld information input/output device to allow a user to hold with one hand both devices and input information with the same hand. Applicants respectfully assert that the plug 58 and socket 32 do not include mechanical latch positions and are in a fixed arrangement that connects the PC card 14 to the PIM 42 not the wireless phone to the PIM 42. Thus, the plug and socket do not comprise a universal joint with mechanical latch positions that latches in at least one position fastening the cellular telephone to a handheld information input/output device as recited in amended claim 18. For at least this reason also, Applicant's amended claim 18 is allowable over Harrison.

At least because dependent claim 19 inherits the features of amended independent claim 18, dependent claim 19 is also allowable over Harrison.

Claim 24

Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended independent claim 24 is drawn to an integrated computing wireless communication apparatus. The apparatus comprises, among other features, a universal joint with mechanical latch positions rotatably connecting a handheld mobile computing device to a handheld wireless communication device at the universal joint, the universal joint allowing separation of the handheld mobile computing device from the handheld wireless communication device such that each device may be used independently of the other device, whereby the connection at the universal joint integrates the handheld mobile computing device and the handheld wireless communication device into a modular two-body apparatus.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to amended claim 1, Applicant's amended claim 24 is not anticipated and is thus, allowable over Harrison. Also, at least because dependent claims 28-34 inherit the features of amended claim 24, claims 28-34 are also allowable over Harrison.

Claim Rejections – 36 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-7, 20, 35, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Campco (USPN 6,073,033 hereinafter "Campco"). The Office Action acknowledges that Harrison does not disclose that the display presents an output image having an orientation adapted based upon a position of the display relative to the wireless display as recited in claims 4, 20, and 35. However, the Office action also asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the output image inversion teaching of Campco with Harrison's device such that it is convenient for the user holding the phone either with the right or left hand to still be able to observe the display in a normal way during a call. Applicant disagrees and respectfully submits, as described above, that Harrison is deficient with respect to disclosing an analogous device as recited in amended independent claims 1, 18, and 24. Because dependent claims 4-7, 20, and 35-36 respectively incorporate the features of amended claims 1, 18, and 24, claims 4-7, 20, and 35-36 are allowable over Harrison in view of Campco.

Claims 8, 9, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Kfouri (USPN 6,549,789 hereinafter "Kfouri"). The Office Action acknowledges that Harrison does not disclose that a universal joint is a pivot rotating the information input/output device tangential to the wireless communication device as recited in claims 8 and 21. However, the Office action also asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the swivel hinge teaching of Kfouri with Harrison's device such that with a 360 degree angle function, the user would be able to view the screen from different angles. Applicant disagrees and respectfully submits, as described above, that Harrison is deficient with respect to disclosing an analogous device as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 18. Neither Harrison nor Kfouri alone or in combination teach or suggest a universal joint that allows separation of the information input/output device from the wireless communication device as recited in amended claims 1 and 18. Thus, at least because dependent claims 8, 9, and 21-23 respectively incorporate the features of amended claims 1 and 18, claims 8, 9, and 21-23 are allowable over Harrison in view of Kfouri.

Claims 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Kobayashi (USPN 6,633,759 hereinafter "Kobayashi"). The Office Action acknowledges that Harrison does not disclose a wireless link transmitting and receiving information between the handheld wireless device and the handheld mobile computer device while the devices are connected via the universal joint as recited in claims 25-27. However, the Office action also asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the wireless link transmitting and receiving information between devices not connected by the universal joint taught in Kobayashi with Harrison's device such that it is convenient for the user to receive or transmit information by carrying only one device. Applicant disagrees and respectfully submits, as described above, that Harrison is deficient with respect to disclosing an analogous device as recited in amended independent claim 24. Because dependent claims 25-27 incorporate the features of amended claim 24, claims 25-27 are allowable over Harrison in view of Kobayashi.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100


Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE